Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member seems to have been continuing the practice of putting questions. He ought to revise his ideas.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—He wants to know.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is certainly not the way. He wanted to know what time I allow for answering calling-attention motions.

FILLING UP OF A VACANCY IN THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under rule 194 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, I have nominated Sri Raja Pid Naik as a member of the Committee on Government Assurances in the vacancy caused by the death of Sri Gopal Salenna. He was a member of the Swatantra Party and I have appointed a member of the same Party in the vacancy.

Next is calling-attention Motion. The Hon'ble Member is absent. He has made a request and I will take it tomorrow.

Next is Presentation of Report.

THIRD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

Sri G. A. THIMMAPPA GOWDA (Hassan).—Sir, I present the Third Report of Committee on Government Assurances.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Third Report of the Committee on Government Assurances is presented.

MOTION UNDER RULE 21 (2) OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN THE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS *Re*: CONSIDERATION OF TWO GOVERNMENT BILLS BEFORE RESUMING DISCUSSION ON THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—Sir, I beg to move under Rule 21 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business that the three Government Bills may be taken up for consideration before resuming discussion on the Governor's Address.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I rise to point of order, Sir. Since two days, on the Governor's Address, Motion of Thanks was under consideration; it was under discussion. In continuation of this discussion, this motion for suspension of rules under Rule 21 (2) has been introduced by the

Government with a *mala fide* intention to see that hasty legislation is passed. They had sufficient time to move that. I hope and trust there is a rumour that the House will be closed on the 5th and that the session will come to an end. In order to take the sanction of the House, they wanted to introduce three Bills which are very important. They don t want to give even sfficient time for dicussion on them. So, with this hasty intention, Governmnet is trying to adjourn important discussion on this motion of thanks on the Governor's Address. It is palatable for the Government to send such circulars for suspension of rules...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am surprised at the point of order raised. He wants things that are most palatable to this palate. I do not think any member is entitled to do that on the floor of the House. He said that it is an important Bill and made it a point of order. Has it ever been mentioned that it is a ground for a point of order ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—He was opposing the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri G. V. Gowda is making his position worse.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—That point I have not reached. Even for introduction how is the Government entitled to introduce ? Govern. ment has somes sense of responsibility. What is this ? At any time at any moment, they think fit, they introduce any Bill they like. But the impact of this Bill...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

I believe there should be a sense of resposibility particularly from the Member who wants to see that another should be responsible. When the rules is there, and when it is being moved to raise a point of order and speak of irresponsibility where am I to locate the irresponsibility ? What is the substance in the point of order ? Which is the rule or which is the precedent on which Sri K. Lakkappa is raising the point of order ? The Hon'ble Member knows that a point of order should be on the contravention of the rules and convention.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—It is a convention.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is a convention?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—The opportunity that must give to the Opposition parties to discuss the Bill. When the important Motion of Thanks is being discussed in the House, abruptly, they introduce a motion for the suspension of rules to introduce Bills. I do not know what is the reason. They could have earlier thought over it and done it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I find that there is no substance. There is not even a semblance of substance in the point of order. I do not know how to characterise it. My ruling on the point of order stands. There is no substance and the little time available has been spent on nothing.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—I quite concede that rule 21 of the the Rules of Procedure arms the Government to come out with a motion like this. What Sri K. Lakkappa was trying to submit was this the desirability of a motion like this before the House...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a point of order ? Ultimately, it depends on the vote of the House. It is the House that decides. If he wants to say that he is embarrassed and there are other reasons, I will give him a little time. But spending time like this ! If the Hon'ble Member looks into the proceedings of yesterday, he will see that it was mentioned. The Business Advisory Committee has considered it. But anyway I am not concerned. The Motion is before the House.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I oppose.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Before Sri S. M. Krishna speaks on the merits of the motion, I wish to bring to your kind notice that you are aware that we agreed to take only two Bills, Bills of a minor nature, even before the Governor's Address is concluded. If we see the agenda...

Mr. SPEAKER.—If three members are to talk on three different lines, it is difficult for me.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—We have agreed to do the Mysore Land...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Member opposing this motion ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—In part.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may oppose it fully, after Mr. Krishna.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಭಾಷಣಕ್ಕೆ ವಂದನೆಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ಮಹತ್ವವನ್ನು ಕಸಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ನಾನು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ಮನಸೂಫೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮನಸೂಫೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಅವರು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಉದ್ದೇಶದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಹುದುಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವರ್ತನೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಮೈ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಮತ್ತು, ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ನಾವಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಂತಹ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿಗೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷ್‌ನ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಉಚ್ಚ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಎಂತಹ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸನ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವುದಾಧರೂ ಭಾರಿ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಕಾಯಿದೆಗಳು ತುರ್ತು ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂತಹ ಗುರುತರವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ಮೇ ರವರ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟಿಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಇವೆ. ಅದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲ್ಸುಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಇರುವ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮುರಿದು ಅವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನರಕಾರದವರು ಈಗಾದರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಧೋರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಈಗ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಮೇಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನಾನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, suspension of Rule under 21 (2) is not ... the Mysore Land Revenue...

(Amendment) Bill and the Mysore Silkworm Seed and Cocoon (Regulation of Production, Supply and Distribution) (Amendment) Bill, there is the Mysore Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill. If this is agreed to, the whole course of discussion will be changed and this is not what hat transpired in the Business Advisory Committee. After all, what we decided in the Business Advisory Committee was that 3½ hours would be allotted for Governor's Address and that within half an hour we could finish two minor Bills.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ರೂಲು 21 (2) ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಿ ಸರಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾರಣ, ಅಂತಹ ಗಂಡಾಂತರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳು ಸರಕಾರದ ಮುಧ್ಯೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮುಂದೂಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಈ ರೂಲು 21 (2) ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಪೋಟಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂದೂ ಇದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ನನಗೆ ಪೋಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ನನಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಆದರೆ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ವಂದನಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪೂರ್ವಭಾವಿಯಾಗಿ ಇತರ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಎಂದು ಅದರ ಷರ್ತುಯನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬಹುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹಣದ ಕೊರತೆಗಾಗಿ ಸೇಲ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮೇಲೆ ಚೆಂಪರಿ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ನಿಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸೇಲ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಸರಕಾರದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲೇನೋ ವ್ಯಾಲ ಫೈಡಿ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇಂತಹುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If a member wants to say anything and particularly in respect of this motion, there should be consistency. Sri G. V. Gowda said that it was agreed to and I suppose he is perfectly correct, and if Sri K. Lakkappa were to say that his leader has not told him, either he is letting down his leader or his leader has committed a default. The agreement was that the two Bills, *viz.*, the Mysore Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill and the Mysore Silkworn Seed and Cocoon (Regulation of Production, Supply and Distribution) (Amendment) Bill which are of a non-controversial nature, would be taken up before the Governor's Address and if this agreement is to be observed, a motion has to be made and it has been made. We will therefore take up these two Bills after the motion is agreed or voted upon. The Rules do not permit a member to say that it is *mala fide*. If I have been indulgent enough to permit a member, it does not mean that it is a vested interest. Such a motion under Rule 21 (2) definitely says that no amendment is permitted or no debate is permitted and the Speaker's elementary duty is to put it to vote. Members won't read the rules. Where do *mala fide* come? The Hon'ble Member Sri Krishna read the

(MR. SPEAKER)

but we have got our own rules and we are bound by them. May's Parliamentary Procedure does not supersede our rules. As I said, the Business Advisory Committee has agreed and the House has adopted the Business Advisory Committee's Reports.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—We do not know what has happened in the Business Advisory Committee. We know only about the report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I put it to the vote of the House.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅವಸರ ಎಂದು. ಈ ಆತುರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಮೊದಲು ಬಂದ ಅಜೆಂಡಾದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 8 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೆ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ 5 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸು ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈಗ ಜಯಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವ ಅಖಿಲ ಭಾರತದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಚುಚ್ಚು ವಂತೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸರಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚುಚ್ಚುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸರಿಯೇ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕಚ್ಚುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸರಿಯೇ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಆದರೆ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೂ ತಾವು ನಿಯಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನನ್ನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸಿನಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ನೋಟೀಸು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಸಭೆ 8ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನದವರೆಗೆ ಅಥವಾ 10 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತೆ ಎಂದು ಇತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇದ್ದಕ್ಕಿಂದ್ದಂತೆಯೇ 5 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸವೇ ಮುಗಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸರಕಾರದೊಡನೆ ಸಹಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ರೂಲ್ ಸಸ್ಪೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ಸೂಚನೆಯು ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ಎಮರ್ಜೆನ್ಸಿ ನಂದರ್ಭ ಒದಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡೇ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಷ್ಟು ಆತುರದಿಂದ, ಜನತಾ ಎಕ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಓಡಿಸುವಂತೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿರುವುದರ ಕಾರಣವಾದರೂ ಏನು? 'ಮನಿ ಬಿಲ್ಸ್' ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಹಣ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮುಗಿದನಂತರ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

† Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—May I draw your attention to rule 21 (2) which says: "On a motion being made that the discussion on the Address be adjourned to a subsequent day to be appointed by the Speaker..." Here the motion is to postpone the discussion and it does not authorise the Speaker to fix the day on which the discussion is to take place and the House is not aware of the day on which the discussion is to take place. To that extent the motion is not in order. In fact, sub-rule (2) of rule 21 does not give power even to the Business Advisory Committee to fix the day on which the discussion to take place nor does it authorise even the Leader of the House to fix the day for it, but it only authorises the Speaker to fix the day on which the discussion is to be taken up. Only when the motion authorises the Speaker to fix the day on which the discussion is to to take place it can be put to the vote of the House because rule 21 (2) says that discussion on the Address may

be postponed in favour of Government Bills or other Government business on a motion being made that discussion on the address be adjourned to a subsequent day to be appointed by the Speaker. We do not see in this motion what day is going to be appointed by the Speaker for the discussion to take place. Of course, the rule says that the Speaker shall forthwith put the question, no amendment or debate being allowed. It is only if the motion is in that form the Speaker can put the motion to the House and not otherwise. Since the motion does not make a mention of the subequent day and since the motion does not authorise the Speaker to fix the day on which the discussion is to take place, to that extent the motion is not in order.

MR. SPEAKER.—All that rule 21 (2) says is that "the discussion on the Address may be postponed in favour of Government Bills of any other Government business on a motion being made that the discussion on the Address be adjourned to a subsequent day to be appointed by the Speaker. The Speaker shall forthwith put the question, no amendment or debate being allowed." Now, what time has been taken on this matter ? What is the motion before the House ?

> "I move under rule 21 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business that 3 Government Bills may be taken up for consideration before resuming discussion on the Governor's Address."

So the request is there. I am putting it to the vote of the House.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—The request is there for postponement of the discussion on the Governor's Address, but the request does not authorise the Speaker to fix a subsequent day for the discussion of the Governor's Address. We do not know on what day the discussion is to take place.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have to fix the day. Do I want authority from them for that ?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—The rule is mandatory.

MR. SPEAKER.—I do not require any authority from them for that. Who is to appoint the day ? The Speaker. Do I require any authority from them for that.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—The motion should authorize the Speaker and then it is for the Speaker to fix the day on which the discussion should take place. Here the motion does not contain the request to the Speaker authorizing him to fix the day.

MR. SPEAKER.—Let the Hon'ble Member be clear and let him not go on changing his argument.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—May I make myself clear ? Sub-rule (2) of rule 21 takes away the power of the Business Advisory Committee and also the power of the Leader of the House to fix the day which the discussion should take place on the Governor's Address. The motion under this sub-rule should authorize the Speaker to fix the day on which

(SRI K. H. RANGANATH)

the discussion should take place. The motion before us is only to this extent that the discussion on the Governor's Address be postponed in favour of the Government Bills indicated in the list, but what sub-rule (2) says is " on a motion being made that the discussion on the Address be adjourned to a subsequent day to be appointed by the Speaker." The motion should have been in this form.

MR. SPEAKER.—The member is only repeating what he has said before. I want to know from the Hon'ble Member whether I want to be clothed with any additional authority from the executive Government to fix the day for discussion on the Governor's Address either in the initial instance or at any other time. If the debate is to be permitted, all that I have to do under the rule is to consult the Leader when I first fix the day. Thereafter the entire authority is with the Speake and it is the Speaker who has to regulate.. If this rule says that the day is to be fixed by me, it is not by virtue of any authority that will be given to me by the executive Government or by a resolution of the House. Suppose the resolution does not mention it. Do I then lose my authority ?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—To understand the implications fully, we have to read rule 18,19, 20 and 21 together. Rule 18 says after the Governor delivers his Address you are at liberty to fix the day on which the discussion shall take place. Now you have exercised that power and you have allowed the discussion and the discussion is taking place since the last 2 days. Now we are at a stage when rule 21 is going to intervene. We want to postpone the discussion going on to a subsequent day and that can be done only by a motion under sub-rule (2) and a motion for the same is before us. So my submisssn is that if it was within your unfettered discretion to fix the day, then there would not have been any mention under rule 21 (2) of the words " to a subsequent day to be appointed by the Speaker ". You have already exercised your power once, namely, allowing the discussion to take place in consultation with the Leader of the House and that discussion is going on for the last 2 days. Now we are at a stage when we want to postpone the discussion and it is done by a motion moved under rule 21 (2). My understanding of this rule is that the motion should authorize the Speaker to fix the day so that the House would be fully aware of the subsequent day on which the discussion is to take place without leaving the House under the mercy of the Leader or the Treasury Benches.

2-30 P. M.

As the motion stands now, we do not know on what day discussion is going to take place. Probably, I think we never had an occasion to intervene in the Governor's Address in this way. I do not know whether there are any precedents but today we have come across for the first time Rule 21 being involved. Therefore, my submission to you is that there should have been mention authorising the Speaker to fix up a date and the Speaker should inform this House on what day it is going to take place taking into consideration the importance of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was already submitted to the House that agreement was there with regard to the two Bills and I am trying to confine the debate to two Bills. When I have given a ruling, the Hon'ble Member must not get up and say that he does not know it. I find the rule is there. The right is of the Speaker to fix a date. The Constitution requires that there should be an opportunity given to the Members of the House to debate on the Address. That is done by moving a Motion of Thanks. That is an established practice and that is also a statutory provision. It is also said that it should be done as early as possible. On a prior occasion it was said that it should not be adjourned and the Members were entitled to take it up. But it should be said that there are adjournment motions and no-confidence motions and such occasions come so many times. Therefore it does not deal with the authority or power of the Speaker to regulate the debate. If it is going to be adjourned on any motion, then it is my duty to fix a time. I do not want to be clothed by executive action when I have got the authority under the Constitution. The Speaker should fix a time for debate on the Governor's Address—Is this rule going to be of any superior authority clothing me with any certain power ? I do not think so. Opportunity to debate should be ample and opportunity should be reasonable. That is the primary thing and that has to be done. I hope the Government will agree to two Bills being taken up today and the third can be taken up tomorrow. I am not sacrificing the rights of the Members. I will protect them undoubtedly.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—We agree to two Bills being taken up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—To that extent it is modified. Now, I put the motion to the House. The question is :

"That the further discussion on the debate on Governor's Address be postponed under rule 21 (2) and two Government Bills be taken up for consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE LAND REVENUE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966.

Motion to consider.

Sri M. V. KRISHNAPPA (Minister for Revenue).— I move :

"That the Mysore Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill, 1966, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill, 1966, be taken into consideration."